

Proposals to Improve Public Education in Texas



Report from
**THE HALE-AIKIN COMMITTEE OF TWENTY-FOUR
FOR
THE STUDY OF TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

December, 1958

PROPOSALS TO IMPROVE PUBLIC EDUCATION IN TEXAS

*Submitted to the Governor, Members of the
56th Legislature and the People of Texas*

by

THE HALE-AIKIN COMMITTEE OF TWENTY-FOUR
FOR
THE STUDY OF TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

DECEMBER, 1958

The Hale - Aikin Committee of Twenty-four

STUDY OF TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

December 15, 1958

TO THE HONORABLE GOVERNOR OF TEXAS, MEMBERS OF THE FIFTY-SIXTH LEGISLATURE AND THE PEOPLE OF TEXAS:

Herewith is our report on a study of the Texas Public Schools which has been made pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 105. (See Appendix B.) Presented as a part of the report are twenty-three proposals for your consideration.

Although this has been a comprehensive study, we could not hope to include every objective and embrace every dream which Texas citizens have for their public schools within the framework of twenty-three proposals. However, we believe the recommendations of this Committee will result in many improvements which are essential to the continued growth and improvement of our public school system. Because of the possible value that this report may have in shaping future educational policies, the Committee has not limited itself to proposals which can be implemented only through legislative action. Some of the basic principles concerning public education which are included in this report may be just as applicable in future years as they are today.

Respectfully submitted,

THE COMMITTEE OF TWENTY-FOUR

A. M. Aikin, Jr.

Chairman

L. DeWitt Hale

Vice - Chairman

J. W. Edgar

Secretary

The Hale - Aikin Committee of Twenty-four

STUDY OF TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

SEN. A. M. AIKIN, JR., *Chairman*
Paris

REP. L. DeWITT HALE, *Vice-Chairman*
Corpus Christi

J. W. EDGAR, *Secretary*
Austin

SEN. FLOYD BRADSHAW
Weatherford

MRS. W. D. de GRASSI
Amarillo

MRS. L. E. DUDLEY
Abilene

EUGENE FISH
Palestine

BROOKS L. HARMAN
Odessa

HORACE K. JACKSON
Gatesville

REP. SCOTT McDONALD
Fort Worth

REP. MALCOLM MCGREGOR
El Paso

MRS. WILL MILLER
Corsicana

J. W. NIXON
Laredo

SEN. GEORGE PARKHOUSE
Dallas

THOMAS B. RAMEY
Tyler

ED RAY
San Antonio

CHARLES E. SIMONS
Dallas

MRS. RAE FILES STILL
Waxahachie

H. W. STILWELL
Texarkana

MRS. VAN HOOK STUBBS
Wortham

FELIX TIJERINA
Houston

STONE WELLS
Houston

DANA WILLIAMS
Corsicana

NAT WILLIAMS
Lubbock

PREFACE

The Legislature directed the Hale-Aikin Committee of Twenty-four to make a thorough study of the Texas public school system. The men and women serving on this Committee have dedicated themselves to the task of making proposals which will guarantee standards of quality in education. The Committee's basic belief in the paramount importance of education is expressed through the proposals contained in this report.

The Committee bases its proposals upon many facts and convictions, from which the following basic principles have been formulated:

1. As a whole, we can be proud of our public schools as they exist today. Many of our Texas schools are giving instruction of excellent quality and rank with the best schools of the nation.
2. The advancement and continuing support of public education is a fundamental obligation of state and local government. A free society must develop its human potential by identifying, nurturing, and wisely using its talents.
3. All the evidence we have indicates that boys and girls will need more and better educational opportunities in the future than have been provided in the past. The quality of education should be such as to enable each child to develop to his full capacity as an individual and as a citizen.
4. The tremendous increase of citizen participation in educational planning in recent years has resulted in decisions by local school boards to provide programs beyond the minimum legal requirements. This indicates that Texans want better educational opportunities than are guaranteed by existing statutes.

The outstanding progress made in Texas during the last decade must be attributed largely to the comprehensive and perceptive study made by the Gilmer-Aikin Committee. Texas public schools have experienced an unprecedented period of growth since the Legislature in 1949 enacted the Gilmer-Aikin school laws. The Minimum Foundation School Program, which in other states is looked upon as a model for school legislation, opened the way to school improvement throughout Texas.

Local school systems, with State assistance, have made rapid strides toward making meaningful a guaranteed educational opportunity for every Texas child. Operating within a legal framework established by the statutes, the citizens of many districts have demonstrated a willingness to go beyond the minimum standard established by the State.

Today, both a larger total number of school children and a larger percentage of school-age children are attending school than ever before in the history of Texas, and these children attend school more days during the year. The average daily attendance in the public schools for 1955-56 was eighty-two and one-tenth per cent of the total scholastic population, compared with seventy-four per cent in ADA in 1949-50. If the percentage of the total scholastic population actually in school were no higher today than it was seven years ago, more than one hundred and fifty-five thousand children now in the public schools would not be there.

The Texas Education Agency and local school boards and administrators deserve commendation for their ability to foresee and meet problems connected with this unprecedented rate of increase in school population. Their greatest challenge was hiring of teachers to meet a thirty-six per cent increase in average daily attendance. The total professional personnel staff of our schools was increased forty-four per cent from 1949 to 1956 without sacrificing the quality of instruction.

Encouraged by the Gilmer-Aikin Laws of 1949, teachers began to make rapid, almost phenomenal progress toward the improvement of their qualifications. In 1949, fifteen per cent of our teachers in Texas had no degree. In 1956, only three and one-half per cent were without degrees. In 1949, seventeen and one-quarter per cent had masters degrees. Only one other state in the nation had a greater number of teachers with four years of college preparation. In the whole nation, only sixty-eight per cent of the public school teachers had four years or more of college preparation.

Teacher retirement benefits have been improved and progress has been made toward improving the salary schedule for teachers--a salary schedule which the Gilmer-Aikin Committee called "one designed to attract, encourage and hold promising people for the teaching profession."

Despite this fine record, there are continuing problems of teacher supply. Salaries and working conditions of teachers must be kept in line with those of all workers and professions. Demands for the very talents and professional training which make good teachers are increasingly evident from business and government. A more complex civilization requires constant re-evaluation and improvement of our educational system. Obtaining qualified personnel is relatively easy in our large cities and educational centers, but there are other parts of the state where a substantial local contribution, in addition to the state-supported minimum salary, is required to attract teachers.

The Hale-Aikin Committee, like the earlier Gilmer-Aikin Committee, is composed of six members appointed by the Governor, six by the Lieutenant Governor, and six by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The present Committee has, in addition, six members appointed by the State Board of Education.

House Concurrent Resolution 105 empowered the Committee of Twenty-four "to effect its own organization and adopt such procedure and operate as may be necessary to carry out fully" the purposes of the resolution.

The Committee was organized October 16, 1957. Officers elected were Senator A. M. Aikin, Jr., chairman; Representative L. DeWitt Hale, vice-chairman; and J. W. Edgar, secretary. Subcommittees and chairmen were named for each of the four problem areas specified in HCR 105: School Program, Nat Williams; Teacher Supply, Horace K. Jackson; School Construction, John Ben Shepperd; School Finance, Charles E. Simons. The death of Lewis Taylor and the resignation of Mr. Shepperd resulted in two committee vacancies which were filled in April, 1958, by the appointments of Brooks L. Harman and Mrs. Van Hook Stubbs. Thomas B. Ramey of Tyler replaced Mr. Shepperd as the subcommittee chairman for School Construction.

The Committee published a study guide designed to solicit facts, opinions, suggestions, and recommendations from every county and school district. Ninety-six thousand study guides were distributed throughout the State. The local committees which conducted the study in each county were organized with the assistance of county superintendents and other school administrators. Lay citizens outnumbered the school personnel serving on the local committees by approximately four to one.

Every one of the 254 counties made detailed reports after more than 50,000 Texans had participated directly in the evaluation of their schools and in preparing the county reports. Information made available by local school officials provided a factual basis for the county reports. Professional organizations and research agencies gave helpful information and assistance. Unanimity of opinion rarely prevailed on any question. Each area of the state has educational needs which differ in some ways from those of other areas.

Likewise, unanimity of opinion rarely prevailed in the Hale-Aikin Committee itself. Proposals contained in this report represent the majority view of the Committee and do not necessarily reflect the individual viewpoint of each member of the Committee.

The Committee insisted that every viewpoint expressed in the county reports be brought to its attention. In this way, the comments and recommendations originated by local study groups received careful consideration by members of the Committee and provided a source of information during all the Committee's deliberations. The proposals in this report are generally the same as those proposed in the majority of the county reports, but the Committee exercised its

right of independent judgment after considering all recommendations from every source.

The Committee wishes to give due credit and recognition to the thousands of Texas citizens who participated in the study at either the State or local level. Specifically, high praise should be accorded to the county superintendents and other school administrators who were so successful in organizing a citizens' committee in each of the 254 counties of Texas. The Texas Education Agency performed outstanding service in providing staff assistance to the committee. Texas Education Agency facilities were available at all times to meet the needs of the Committee for statistical data, for analysis of county reports, for administrative and clerical services, and for the publication and mailing of Committee notices and reports. Finally, the Committee wishes to express appreciation to the press, radio, and television for the excellent coverage given to the work of the Committee.

The Texas Legislature has consistently demonstrated its willingness to provide good schools when the facts are available upon which to base a sound program of legislation. In his charge to this Committee, Governor Price Daniel reiterated the Texas goal of making our schools "second to none." The Committee believes a school system "second to none" is an objective worthy of every Texan's careful consideration and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
HALE-AIKIN COMMITTEE OF TWENTY-FOUR	ii
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL	iii
PREFACE	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
PROPOSALS ON:	
SCHOOL PROGRAM	1
TEACHER SUPPLY	10
SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION	18
SCHOOL FINANCE	22
APPENDIX:	
ESTIMATED COST OF PROPOSALS (Appendix A)	32-33
HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 105 (Appendix B)	34
LIST OF COUNTY CHAIRMEN (Appendix C)	36

SCHOOL PROGRAM

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS REGARDING CURRICULUM

Since the beginning of the Texas public school system, the Legislature has from time to time enacted statutes affecting the curriculum in the public schools. These statutes have been concerned with such matters as teaching the constitutions of the United States and Texas, citizenship, and requirements regarding certain specific subjects that should be taught in Texas schools. These statutes were enacted separately over a long period of years and form no cohesive pattern that will serve to guide a conscientious school administrator who wishes to conform to the laws of this State.

Present statutes define a school day as being at least seven hours, and the Minimum Foundation Program provides that each school offer instruction for nine months. This has been interpreted by the State Board of Education to mean a minimum of 175 days of instruction. Many Texas schools now exceed this minimum.

Certain other statutes define the responsibility of the State Board of Education and local boards of education, but they have never been organized into one comprehensive proposal which clearly defines the minimum responsibility of the State Board of Education and local boards for curriculum planning.

It is the opinion of this committee that certain of the present statutes pertaining to curriculum should be repealed, and a statute enacted that will clearly define the subjects that must be taught in each school as well as curriculum responsibilities of the State Board of Education and local boards of education. This statute should also establish the responsibility of each district in regard to the number of years of education available and the length of the school year. The following is proposed in order to achieve these objectives.

PROPOSAL I

1. Each public school district should provide for a full twelve-grade program of education of not less than 185 days per year, being a minimum of 180 days of classroom instruction and a minimum of five days of formal in-service education programs for teachers and staff members with such programs conforming to standards established by the Texas Education Agency. Local districts may elect to operate a program with a minimum of 190 days of instruction and a minimum of five days for formal in-service education programs. In either instance, the allocation of Minimum Foundation Funds will be based on the number of days taught and the number of days of in-service training.

2. Each district should provide the twelve-grade program of instruction within its own bounds or make financial arrangements with the receiving district to provide educational facilities for transferred pupils.
3. The statutes of the State should require each public school system to provide adequate instruction in:

English, spelling, reading, writing and arithmetic in the primary and elementary grades

The Constitutions of the United States and Texas
(Article 2663b - 1 sec. 1)

Citizenship, the American heritage and patriotism
(Article 289 - Penal Code)

The history and geography of Texas, the United States, and the world (Article 2911)

Use of the English language
(Article 2911 and Article 288 of the Penal Code)

Pre-school orientation in basic English for non-English speaking children

Mathematical concepts and skills

Scientific knowledge

Health and physical fitness, including the harmful effects of alcohol and narcotics

Such other instruction as may be required by the State Board of Education or by local school boards as determined to provide for the varying needs of all pupils in the district, both terminal and college bound. This instruction should include vocational education and foreign languages.

3. The Texas Education Agency should be specifically charged with the responsibility for developing the detailed policies for implementing the instructional program described herein and for setting standards of performance and for the promotion of pupils. It is understood that these standards should be such as will upgrade, as rapidly as possible, the program of education to a high level of excellence.

4. The local school board should have the optional authority to use local funds to establish kindergartens, operate programs of adult education, and provide additional courses for enrichment of instruction that have been approved by the Texas Education Agency. The cost of such programs and/or courses should not be included as a part of Minimum Foundation Program.
-

The citizens of Texas have expressed a desire that every child in this State be provided a sound and adequate program of education that will enable him to develop to his full capacity as an individual and as a citizen.

Many reports from county study groups indicated that the school program should be strengthened by increasing the amount of time pupils spend in school. Suggestions were made for adding to the length of the school day, the school year, and to the number of years spent in school.

Some local study groups also reported that many of the statutes concerning the school curriculum are now outmoded or obsolete and, therefore, are not applicable to present-day educational needs. There were many suggestions that statutory requirements concerning the school curriculum be stated in general terms and that flexibility for meeting changing conditions be provided by charging the State Board of Education with the responsibility of implementing statutes.

In addition to the responsibility of the State Board of Education for implementing statutes, it was indicated that the local boards of education should retain the responsibility for enrichment of instruction beyond the minimum essentials established by law and State Board policies.

ALLOTMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL UNITS

The Minimum Foundation Law presently provides for the allocation of classroom teacher units (C. T. U.) on the basis of the average daily attendance of pupils during the previous school year. This results in hardships for rapidly growing communities with increasing school enrollments.

Many Texas school districts have developed accelerated programs for academically talented pupils, but there is no state-wide plan for providing a minimum program of education for these pupils, and no provision in the Minimum Foundation Act for additional teachers for such instruction.

The Legislature has assigned to the Department of Public Safety and the Texas Education Agency the responsibility for keeping high standards in the driver education program. Teachers of driver education are not now included as special service teachers under the Minimum Foundation Laws, although many local

school districts do provide these teachers through the regular classroom teacher allotment or through the use of local funds.

At the present time, full-time principals are allocated on the basis of one for each twenty classroom teacher units and an additional one for each thirty units.

General administrative positions are not provided by the Minimum Foundation Program in proportion to the size of the school, which means that a school with several hundred teachers must provide assistant superintendents, business managers and other administrative positions, as needed, from local funds.

Research has shown that many children who enter school without a speaking knowledge of the English language are required to repeat a grade one or more times during their school career. A solution to this problem has been attempted in many local districts by providing, through local funds, special pre-school work for non-English speaking children. The State makes no provision for this type of special instruction, although it is needed both to prevent drop-outs from school and to avoid the unnecessary repetition of grades because of a language barrier.

The Committee believes a stronger program of instruction could be provided if the following changes were made in the allocation of units under the Minimum Foundation Law.

PROPOSAL II

1. The teacher-pupil ratio should be calculated on the basis of current average daily attendance, provided, however, that any decrease in average daily attendance should not cause a school to lose a teacher unit during the current year.
2. Special teacher units for the academically talented pupils in secondary schools should be allotted to districts which develop a program approved by the Texas Education Agency to provide for such pupils and which have a designated number of pupils who can qualify as being eligible.
3. Teachers of driver education classes should be added to the present categories for special service personnel.

The number of classroom teacher units required for allocating special service units should be changed from twenty to seventeen, provided the school operates a program of driver education approved by the Texas Education Agency in which special service teacher units are used to staff the program.

4. The formula for allocation of full-time principals should be changed to provide one for sixteen classroom teacher units and an additional principal unit for each additional twenty-four classroom teacher units. In no event should more than one full-time principal per campus unit be approved.
5. Assistant superintendent units should be allocated on the same salary schedule as high school principals but on a twelve-month basis, according to the following formula:

1 for 150-299 CTU's
2 for 300-499 CTU's
3 for 500-999 CTU's
One additional for each additional 1,000 CTU's
6. Special pre-school instructional units for non-English speaking children, who are at least five years of age and who are eligible to enter the first grade the ensuing year, should be provided in accordance with a plan to be developed by the Texas Education Agency.

Many of the county reports requested a lowering of the present teacher-pupil ratio for classroom teacher units and thereby provide additional teachers. Because of the difficulty of securing qualified teachers and the great cost of decreasing the teacher-pupil ratio for classroom teacher units, it is recommended that the teacher-pupil ratio for classroom teacher units not be changed but that the instructional program be strengthened by making the changes described in Proposal II.

PREPARATION OF TEACHERS

The continuing effort to improve the competence of teachers after certification--generally referred to as in-service education--is a responsibility of the local district and has depended almost exclusively upon the leadership given to it by local school officials.

In 1955, the Texas Legislature passed a new certification law. In implementing the provisions of this law, the State Board of Education adopted standards requiring teacher education candidates to have approximately 40 per cent of their work in general education, 40 per cent in the area of academic specialization, and 20 per cent in courses designed for the professional preparation of teachers. Since this program does not affect all teachers now teaching in the state, the following proposal is made.

PROPOSAL III

1. Although the 1955 certification act provided for a balanced program of teacher training for all teachers beginning training after this date, many certified teachers now in service have not had this balanced program. State and local policies should encourage all teachers who have not completed the balanced program provided by the certification act of 1955 to continue training until they have a major in the area of teaching assignment. Ultimately, the State Board of Education should require all teachers to teach in their major field.
 2. Each school district should develop a plan for formal in-service education programs for teachers and staff members consisting of a minimum of five days and conforming to standards established by the Texas Education Agency.
-
-

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Before the Gilmer-Aikin laws, there was no state provision for instructional materials other than in the rural schools covered by the Equalization Acts.

The Minimum Foundation Program Act provided an allotment for general maintenance and operation of the school and for the purchase of instructional supplies. The amount now allocated is \$350 per classroom teacher unit in the larger schools and \$400 per teacher in the small schools. These figures were in the law passed ten years ago and are not realistic in terms of the increased costs in maintenance and operation that have occurred during the past decade.

Many schools are unable to provide adequate instructional materials and to equip laboratories and libraries with the allotment now provided. Almost half of the counties reported that there were schools in the county with inadequate elementary and/or high school libraries.

The Federal Communications Commission has assigned the State of Texas eighteen television channels to be used for education purposes. Fifteen of these channels are still unassigned and unless positive action is taken by the Legislature and educational institutions, it is possible that the State may lose some of these channels.

For more than ten years the State has not purchased additional materials for the State Film Library. In a number of areas regional libraries developed by local school systems and colleges have met the needs for schools within the area served.

The following proposals are made in order to improve laboratories and libraries and to provide adequate audio-visual instruction.

PROPOSAL IV

1. The allotment of State funds for services and operating cost should be increased from \$350-400 to \$600 per eligible professional unit, and the \$100 per unit credit now provided in the Minimum Foundation Law in establishing the local fund assignment should be abolished.
 2. The Legislature should take the necessary steps to preserve for the children of Texas the television channels now allocated for educational purposes, and the Texas Education Agency should continue to inquire into developments in this field and at some subsequent date make recommendations to the Legislature.
 3. Regional libraries for audio-visual materials should be established on a cooperative basis with the State, participating school districts and colleges sharing the cost.
-

EDUCATIONAL GUIDANCE SERVICES

The Minimum Foundation Act presently provides one counselor or supervisor for each forty classroom teacher units plus one counselor or supervisor for each additional fifty classroom teacher units or major fraction thereof. One counselor may serve several smaller schools that participate in a cooperative agreement. In addition to these provisions, schools may employ counselors from local funds.

The State Department of Education makes consultative guidance services available to local schools on a very limited basis, but does not have a Division of Guidance Services.

PROPOSAL V

1. A division of Guidance Services should be established in the Texas Education Agency to provide State-wide leadership in setting up local guidance programs.
2. Each local school should have the responsibility for establishing guidance services according to a plan approved by the Texas Education Agency.

The need for improved guidance services was recognized in a majority of county reports. It would appear that there is a general feeling over the State that ways and means for improvement of instruction should include provision for an adequate guidance program in each school. The reports particularly emphasized the increasing need for guidance for gifted or academically talented pupils.

SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION

The present laws permit, but do not require, each school district, with county board approval, to establish a system of transportation for school children. If a pupil lives two or more miles from school, measured by the nearest public road traveled, or two or more miles from a commercial bus line within a city, he is eligible to ride a school bus and can be counted in determining Foundation Program allocations.

The State contributes to this program according to a formula based on (1) the greatest number of pupils on a bus at any one time, which varies from 72 pupils per bus to 15-19 pupils per bus and ranging in cost from \$2,350 per year to \$1,450 per year, (2) the average length of bus routes which are 45-55 miles of daily travel, and (3) the condition of the roads over which the buses travel.

In addition to the transportation program provided by the State, local districts have the authority to provide transportation for resident pupils regardless of distance they may reside from school, provided these costs are paid from local funds.

PROPOSAL VI

1. The transportation formula should provide for an additional \$400 per year for operation and replacement of buses in districts operating on a ten-months basis; or \$390 per year for buses operating in districts on a nine and one-half months basis.
2. The provision of the law imposing a limitation on the transportation of children living within city limits of cities where there are public transportation systems should be amended so that all children will have equal opportunities under the law for public school transportation.
3. Any child whose route to school involves unusual hazards should be entitled to transportation under the Foundation Program regardless of the distance involved. The determination of "hazardous" should be made by the local board of education and approved by the Texas Education Agency.

COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE LAW

Present statutes, Article 2892, V.C.S., and Article 297 of the Penal Code, provide that all children who are seven years of age and not more than sixteen years of age must attend school for at least 120 days annually in the districts where they reside or in districts to which they may have been transferred.

Present day demands for an educated citizenship cannot be met with a six-month (120-day) period of compulsory attendance, which period itself is most difficult to enforce under present statutes.

PROPOSAL VII

Present statutes should be revised to provide for the enforcement of compulsory education for all children of scholastic age (between six and seventeen) for the full school year unless:

1. A child is exempt because of (a) attendance in a private or parochial school, (b) has completed a 12-grade school program, (c) is physically or mentally unable to attend.
2. The child concerned is at least fourteen years of age and has a work permit issued by the county judge.

TEACHER SUPPLY

Industrialization and a continuing high birth rate have accelerated the population growth of Texas in recent years. More and more children will be seeking an education next year and for many years to come. The supply of qualified teachers must, therefore, be increased each year at an expanding rate.

Substantial progress has been made. Comparison of the qualifications of the average Texas teacher of today with those of an average teacher of ten years ago yields pleasing results. Texas teachers, aided and supported by a strong public interest in good schools, have proven their profession worthy of the ablest college graduates. Other professions requiring extensive school and college preparation, such as medicine, law and engineering, recognize today, more than at any previous time in history, the basic importance of education.

Each improvement in the elementary and secondary schools ultimately produces better doctors, lawyers, scientists, teachers, and--not the least of all--better citizens.

The Committee believes:

1. The State should guarantee a minimum salary level for each teacher in the Texas public school system at a level to justify the amount of preparation and experience required. School systems should be able to compete successfully with business and industry in the recruitment of professional personnel.
2. The State salary schedule should provide annual increments which will permit a teacher to move from the minimum to the maximum salary in a reasonable period of time.
3. Each teacher should be provided opportunities for professional improvement throughout his professional career. Tangible recognition of work completed beyond the baccalaureate degree should be reflected in the salary schedule.
4. The State should insure that programs of teacher education maintain an appropriate balance between subject matter fields, professional education, and general education.
5. Provision should be made for the recognition of outstanding teaching.
6. The selection, employment, and assignment of teacher personnel should be the responsibility of local boards of education.

Background

For the past five years the public school population in Texas has been growing at an average rate of 74,685 pupils per year. As one result of this rapid growth local school officials are faced with a serious problem of recruiting professional personnel to meet the requirements of the schools.

A survey questionnaire sent to all Texas school superintendents by the Texas Education Agency in 1958 asked for teacher supply and demand data for 1956-57, the most recent school year on which complete tabulations could be made. The summary of returns on this questionnaire shows that 6,830 public school teachers who taught in 1955-56 were not available for employment in 1956-57.

Reports from 254 county committees participating in the work of the Hale-Aikin Committee indicate a total present need for 4,343 additional teachers to fill positions now vacant, to relieve overcrowded classrooms and to provide necessary instruction not now offered. These reports also indicate a present need for 3,349 additional teachers to replace present teaching personnel, such as teachers lacking college degrees, teachers holding temporary assignments and teachers lacking the desired competencies that teachers should have. Thus a present need is indicated for 7,702 additional personnel in the teaching profession. Considered in the light of total teaching and special service personnel in the Texas public school system of 74,500, the present need is more than 10 per cent of the present staff, if figures supplied by the county committees are accurate.

County reports also indicate a future need for teaching personnel. The projected need for the five-year period from 1958 through 1963 indicates that 46,252 additional professional personnel must be recruited in the Texas public school system to meet larger school enrollments, to replace teachers who leave the profession and to provide staff for added educational programs which are considered essential to an adequate school system. To meet this projected need, an average of 9,250 additional teachers will have to be supplied annually during the next five years if our public schools are to be adequately staffed.

While the Hale-Aikin Committee has no way of verifying the accuracy of these figures on teacher needs, they are included in this report for whatever value they may have as reflecting the thinking of county committees on Teacher Supply.

A study of the reports made by the County Hale-Aikin Committees provides a wide and fertile field of ideas for the improvement of teacher supply in Texas. As might be expected, better salary was most universally named as the prime need. Other important considerations were listed as better working conditions and better living conditions. In-service training programs met with widespread appeal to improve the quality of instruction and to promote a more professional attitude among teaching personnel. The recommended minimum salaries for teachers ranged from a low of \$3,204.00 to a high of \$6,000.00, with the median recommendation being \$4,000.00. It is significant that only 58 counties recommended a figure less than \$4,000.00, whereas 90 counties recommended

\$4,200 and above. The recommended maximum salaries for teachers ranged from a low of \$3,852.00 to a high of \$12,000.00, with the median recommendation being \$6,500.00. The average time suggested for a teacher to advance from the minimum salary to the maximum was 22 years, although county reports indicated a general desire to shorten this period of time. Six counties recommended that there be no limit placed on the maximum salary which could be paid to teaching personnel.

County reports indicated overwhelming support for retaining "years of experience" and "college degree" as the principal bases upon which to build an adequate salary schedule. It is significant to note, however, that 61 counties reported that there were or should be ways to relate the salary schedule to teaching performance.

There has been a slight increase in the percentage of men in the total number of classroom teachers in Texas since 1952-53. In that year 22.1 per cent of the classroom teachers were men as compared to 23.5 per cent in 1956-57. Reports from school officials show that twice as many men as women leave teaching to enter other professions.

Study by counties of the emergency teaching permits issued during 1956-57 shows that some regions of Texas were affected more than others. The southwest section of the State was affected to the greatest degree; however, the Panhandle and western areas of the State also had spotted concentrations of emergency permits issued.

Teacher recruitment has been the main objective of the State-wide television series begun by the Texas Education Agency in September, 1956. Co-sponsored by the Texas Association of School Administrators, the third year in this recruitment series is now in progress. It is supported by the Texas television industry and the Fund for the Advancement of Education and is presented in cooperation with Texas schools and colleges. Although 712 students were officially registered in the telecourse during the first two years and 391 of these have gone into teaching, these figures actually reflect only a small part of the State-wide emphasis which this project has given to teacher recruitment through the combined efforts of schools, colleges, professional and lay groups, and twenty Texas television stations. Fifteen hundred has been cited as a very conservative estimate of the number of degree teachers now employed in Texas schools who probably would not be there if the project had never been undertaken.

The Texas Legislature passed a new certification law in 1955 and the State Board of Examiners for Teacher Education has assisted the State Board of Education in designing teacher education standards which will improve quality in teacher preparation programs.

Beginning next year, all new teachers will have approximately 40 per cent of their college work in their teaching field, 40 per cent in general education courses (mathematics, natural sciences, English, social sciences, etc.) and 20 per cent in education courses designed for the professional teacher.

PROPOSAL I

1. The State salary schedule should provide a minimum annual salary of \$4,000 for a teacher with a bachelor's degree based upon 10 months of service and a minimum annual salary of \$3,800 based upon 9 1/2 months of service. Annual increments at the rate of \$10 per month for each year of teaching service should be added to the bachelor's degree minimum to attain a \$5,000 maximum for 10 months of teaching based upon 10 years of service and a \$4,750 maximum for 9 1/2 months of teaching based upon 10 years of service.
2. The State salary schedule should provide a minimum annual salary of \$4,200 for a teacher with a master's degree based upon 10 months of service and a minimum annual salary of \$3,990 based upon 9 1/2 months of service. Annual increments at the rate of \$10 per month for each of the first 12 years and an annual increment of \$20 per month for each of the next 3 years should be added to the master's degree minimum to attain a \$6,000 maximum for 10 months of teaching based upon 15 years of service and a \$5,700 maximum for 9 1/2 months of teaching based upon 15 years of service.

PROPOSAL II

Provision should be made by law to grant sick leave to professional personnel without financial loss to such personnel. The minimum program should provide not less than five days of sick leave during each school year, with each individual being allowed to accumulate unused leave from year to year until a maximum accumulation of thirty days is acquired. Strict legal requirements should be written into the law to prevent any possible abuse in the use of sick leave.

PROPOSAL III

The State should provide for the utilization of retired teachers on a modified service basis.

PROPOSAL IV

Provision should be made for increment credit on the salary schedule for a maximum of five years of military service for persons qualified to teach prior to going into service.

The Hale-Aikin Committee made a careful study of the salary recommendations made by the 254 county committees. They were concerned primarily with the retention of teachers in the profession, and also with the question of what salary schedule would attract qualified young people today to the selection of teaching as a career. The local committees indicated that a minimum salary of \$4,000 is needed and that the maximum should exceed \$6,000. The salary schedule included in the above proposal substantially meets the recommendations of the county committees and also provides for the implementation of recommendations for lengthening of the school term.

Other Proposals

The following proposals do not necessarily require legislative action.

PROPOSAL V

A State-wide program of recruitment should be developed which will insure a steady flow of qualified personnel into the teaching profession.

PROPOSAL VI

Incentives should be developed at both the State and local levels which will promote the retention of qualified personnel and improve teaching as a professional career. These incentives might include:

1. A program of salary increments to be developed and administered at the local level whereby outstanding teachers can be rewarded for excellence in their profession.
 2. Working conditions in the teaching profession that will attract young people to choose teaching as a career. This might include satisfactory tenure provisions, contractual relations, opportunities for advancement, improved leave programs, equalized workloads, better training facilities, and a favorable climate for professional development.
 3. Opportunities for the advancement of qualified teachers within the school system.
-

PROPOSAL VII

Utilization of teacher personnel should be improved by action at both the State and local levels to attain better use of teachers' skills in the daily program and greater employment stability among the teaching profession on an annual basis.

1. To the extent possible, professional personnel should be assigned primarily professional duties. This can be achieved by the use of student help, the employment of clerical assistants, and the utilization of teacher aides.
2. Steps should be taken to equalize the workload assigned to professional personnel.
3. To the extent possible, all teachers should be assigned to duty in their major fields of preparation.
4. School programs should be reorganized to promote better utilization of professional personnel. This might be achieved through improvements in the scheduling of classes, the elimination of study halls, a de-emphasis on extracurricular activities, and grouping of students in such a way that fast learners will not be retarded in the education program by the presence in their classes of slow learners.
5. School districts should be reorganized to the extent necessary to achieve optimum utilization of professional personnel and a minimum educational program for the students of each district. This can be achieved by consolidation of school districts, by transfers of students to school districts having a more adequate program of instruction, by cooperative arrangements between school districts for administrative services, and by use of the county unit system.

PROPOSAL VIII

Professional excellence of professional personnel should be improved by strengthening preparatory requirements and by instituting a coordinated program of in-service training.

1. Preparatory educational requirements for teaching should be continuously evaluated.

2. General educational requirements in the preparatory field should be such as to provide each teacher with a broad general educational background to supplement training received in the specialized field of subject matter to be taught.
 3. Participation in the in-service training program should be required of every teacher in the school system.
-

While making the above proposals, the Hale-Aikin Committee of Twenty-four has had the benefit of all the county reports. The reports contained many valuable suggestions, some of which will be mentioned here.

The reports left no doubt but that salary is considered to be the main holding strength of the teaching profession. However, a clear majority of all the county reports sanctioned the use of six other methods whereby more teachers might be made available. These methods and the number of counties reacting favorably to them are as follows:

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 1. Recruit liberal arts graduates who lack one or more required courses in teacher education. | 192 |
| 2. Try to increase interest in teaching in high schools and colleges. | 235 |
| 3. Better utilization of teachers through use of clerical assistants. | 184 |
| 4. Better utilization of teachers of small classes through school organization. | 143 |
| 5. Allow laymen to teach one or more classes. | 147 |
| 6. Employ certified teachers on part-time basis. | 151 |

Scholarships for teacher education students, provision of opportunities for high school students to do some teaching, improvement of teacher education programs, and calling on the teaching profession to quit running down their own profession were mentioned by a sprinkling of counties.

Scattered suggestions for better utilization of teachers of small classes included the use of vocational teachers on the same basis as other teachers.

The reports from forty counties indicated that qualified laymen might be used successfully as teachers in specialized fields. Fifteen county reports stated that laymen should be used only as resource people, while twenty-one expressed the feeling that laymen should be used only in cases of emergency. Seven county reports suggested that retired teachers be permitted to fill teacher vacancies.

One hundred and ninety-five counties reported that satisfactory utilization of teachers is being made "to the fullest extent," but the remaining reports indicated that some improvement in utilization could be made.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Traditionally each school district in Texas has financed schoolhouse construction through the issuance of school district tax bonds with maturities usually ranging from fifteen (15) to thirty (30) years.

Two statutes govern the amount of debt that may be incurred by a school district. One statute authorizes a school district to incur a bonded debt that may be serviced by a fifty cent tax levy on the one hundred dollar assessed valuation. The other legal authority provides for a maximum bonded debt of from seven to ten per cent of a district's assessed valuation, the exact percentage being determined by the tax levy for maintenance purposes. The qualified voters of each district may determine the statutes under which the district will operate. In determining whether a district has the financial ability to provide needed additional classrooms, it must be assumed that the district will exercise the authority granted it by statutes.

WHAT IS THE PRESENT AND PREDICTED NEED FOR CLASSROOMS IN TEXAS SCHOOL DISTRICTS ?

Reports from County Hale-Aikin Committees indicate present and predicted need for classrooms as follows:

Present Need:

107 counties indicated they have enough classrooms to house current enrollment.

138 counties reported a total current need for 3,373 classrooms.

9 counties made no report on this question.

Future Need:

Counties reported a combined need for 17,284 additional classrooms during the five-year period, 1958-63. The combined present and future need is for 20,657 classrooms.

Analysis of Need:

Each county Hale-Aikin committee was asked to determine the present need for additional classrooms on the basis of local policies governing the organization of the instructional program. These county committees were also asked to estimate scholastic population growth through the 1962-63 school year, to determine the future need for classrooms and to establish a value of the present and future classrooms needed in terms of local construction costs. No attempt has been made to convert these data to a uniform standard for the State as a whole.

The reported need for classrooms was categorized in terms of (1) the scholastic population changes that have occurred in the counties reporting the classroom deficiency, and (2) the reasons for the shortage which were cited in the county reports.

Analysis of scholastic population trends in Texas shows that sixty-one (61) or twenty-four (24) per cent of the counties of the state have experienced a growth in scholastic population of more than twenty-six (26) per cent since 1947. The additional classrooms needed in these sixty-one (61) counties represent 76.8 per cent of the total needed additional classrooms as reported by the State as a whole. Only twelve (12) per cent of this need was reported by the 144 counties that have shown a decline in scholastic population.

County reports indicate that the present and future need for classrooms is 20,657. Increased enrollment accounts for 18,080, program changes for 572, administrative changes for 147, and other changes for 1,858. Needs are based on the percentage of county scholastic population change between 1947 and 1957.

CAN NEEDED CLASSROOMS IN TEXAS SCHOOL DISTRICTS BE FINANCED UNDER PRESENT LEGAL STRUCTURE ?

The County Hale-Aikin Committee Reports indicated an estimated cost of \$373,008,338 to finance the construction of the 20,657 classrooms needed between now and 1963.

One or more school districts in 43 counties were reported to be unable, under their present legal authority, to finance the construction of needed classrooms. Investigation of the school tax rates in these counties revealed that some of the districts apparently were unaware that they are authorized to vote bonds under the provisions of Article 2784e-1.

Even after applying Article 2784e-1, however, there are 73 school districts in 35 counties which could not finance their estimated classroom construction costs with their present assessed valuations.

Analysis of assessment data and estimates of funds needed to finance needed additional classrooms submitted by county committees indicates that each district in Texas could provide the needed additional classrooms under present bonding authority and not exceed the highest assessment ratio used by some of the school districts in the state.

PROPOSAL

The present practice of financing school buildings from local district tax funds should be continued, with careful study being given to the available legal alternatives which might enable the local district to obtain additional resources.

Some of the legal alternatives include:

Increasing property assessments for school purposes.

Increasing tax rates.

Reappraising classroom needs to provide the minimum essential classrooms for educational purposes.

The possibility of combining districts with nearby districts.

Declining population districts may join their educational programs with districts experiencing population growth. Likewise, districts with declining income may seek attachment to a wealthier adjoining district, thereby pooling their financial resources for the benefit of all school children and the community.

Each school district must determine what should be included in school construction. The limited resources of a particular community may call for a reduction of desires as distinguished from needs.

Studies in improved utilization of school plants have been underway in Texas during the past two years and extensive research being done now is aimed at reductions in the cost of school buildings. Experimentation and research in the field of school plant utilization and building construction should continue to be emphasized. Research findings and promising ideas for better utilization should be made available to all districts which have a present need or predicted need for additional classrooms.

It is easier to maintain sound business practices in the management and expenditure of public funds when those funds are locally controlled and administered. As long as the citizens of each community, through their local school boards, are authorized to set policies for and manage their own schools, Federal or State encroachment is less likely to interfere with the long-established pattern of local control of education in Texas.

SCHOOL FINANCE

The provision of an adequate program of public school education for every child in Texas is a responsibility shared by state and local authorities. The development of a high degree of local autonomy in the administration of Texas schools results from actions of the Legislature in delegating its authority to the communities. Proposals contained in this report are designed to foster a continued high degree of local control of public schools.

The Committee believes:

1. The State should continue its support of a minimum foundation program of public school education, redefining this program as needed to guarantee that adequate educational opportunities are available to every child of school age.
2. Support of the minimum program should be borne jointly by state and local authorities with a fair share being assigned to each school district.
3. The State should continue to guarantee the availability of funds with which to finance its share of the minimum program.
4. Each school district should accept the responsibility for operating a program at the minimum level or above and levy a tax sufficient to pay its full share of the Minimum Program cost; the State should establish flexible standards which respect the autonomy of local districts but which will make it impossible for any school district to fall short in meeting its obligation of providing at least the minimum program.
5. The amount assigned to each district as its share of the minimum program cost should leave unencumbered local taxing authority that will enable a district, by making its maximum effort, to: (1) operate a school program above the minimum level, and (2) provide necessary school facilities.
6. The State should establish policies that will insure changes in local patterns of school organization and management whenever these patterns directly or indirectly deny any child his right to 12 years of public education in an accredited school. State action should be taken now and in the future to correct any inequity or denial of opportunity which may occur as the result of the failure of a district to make available a full 12-year program for the resident scholastics of that district.
7. No recommendation of the Hale-Aikin Committee shall be interpreted to give to the Texas Education Agency, or anyone whomsoever, the power to close, to consolidate, or cause by regulation or rule to be closed or consolidated, any independent or common school district in this State. It is the express purpose of this Committee that the General Laws as they now exist in regard to consolidation or otherwise closing of school districts of this State shall continue in full force and effect.

LOCAL - STATE SUPPORT

Texas public schools are supported by local and state revenues with a small percentage of support coming from the Federal Government. As the number of children increases, additional revenue must be made available. Each new need for school support raises the question of whether the support is to come from local, state or federal sources.

The Texas Minimum Foundation Program provides a system of automatic financing which guarantees to local school districts that state funds will be available to pay the cost of the minimum school program defined in law. School support comes from:

1. The State Available School Fund
2. The Minimum Foundation School Program Fund
3. Local School Taxes

Classroom teacher units are allocated on the basis of the average daily attendance of the preceding school year. Basically, one classroom teacher unit (CTU) is allocated for each 26 pupils in average daily attendance, although this ratio varies somewhat following the formula of the statutes. The allocation of other professional units (principals, supervisors, counselors, etc.) is tied directly to the number of classroom teacher units. Although changes are recommended elsewhere in this report, these allocations under present law are made as follows:

- 1 special service teacher to 20 CTU's
- 1 supervisor or counselor to each 40 CTU's
- 1 full-time principal to each 20 CTU's

The program provides \$350 or \$400 operational allowances for each CTU. One superintendent is allocated to each district having a four-year accredited high school. Also, the costs of operating special education, vocational education, and school transportation programs are provided through the Minimum Foundation Program in accordance with special formulas established by the State Board of Education.

When the Minimum Foundation Program was established, local fund assignments were set at a total of \$45,000,000, which was 25 per cent of the Gilmer-Aikin Committee's estimated cost of the Program for the 1949-50 school year.

Local school districts now are assessed 20 per cent of the state-wide operating cost of the Foundation Program as estimated by the State Board of Education for the immediately preceding year. After the amount of the local districts' share of the cost has been determined, the proportionate share of the amount to be

borne by each county and district is calculated through the application of an economic index. Pay rolls, mineral production, agriculture, manufacturing, assessed property valuations and scholastic population data are used as provided in the statutes for the calculation of the economic index.

The amount assigned to each school district is then adjusted by deducting:

1. An amount equal to \$100 times the number of professional units for which the district is eligible under the Minimum Foundation Program.
2. The per cent that the combined area of university, prison, military, or Federal forest lands in a district bears to the total area of the district.

These deductions from the local fund assignment are absorbed in the State's cost of the Foundation Program, thereby reducing the local district's participation in the Foundation Program cost from 20 to 16 per cent. In 1957-58, these reductions amounted to \$8,640,477.

Analysis of the exempt land provisions of the Foundation Program Act indicates that there is little or no correlation between the ability to support public education and the relationship that exists between the area of public lands within the school district and the area of a school district. Also, the allowance of \$100 deduction (from the local funds assigned) for each professional unit is reducing the assessment of some districts in the State to the point that no local payment whatsoever is made toward the cost of the Foundation Program. If an allowance is made for each professional unit, it would be more appropriate to include such allowances as a part of the cost of the Foundation Program.

PROPOSAL I

Although the Legislature has indicated on several occasions that the combined payments of local school districts to the Minimum Foundation Program should be 20 per cent, deductions from local fund assignments have resulted in an increasing percentage of the program cost being borne by the State. To restore and maintain the 80-20 ratio between state and local support of the Foundation Program, it is proposed that the Foundation Program Act be amended to repeal the provision for exemptions based on the location of certain public lands in a district as well as the provisions allowing \$100 deduction from the local funds assigned for each professional unit of eligibility in a district.

The schools will continue to be operated in accordance with sound business principles if local interest in the management of the schools is stimulated by the fact that a substantial amount of local tax funds is included in the school budgets. The responsibility of the State-local partnership is felt more keenly by the local taxpayer who realizes that any unnecessary expense of State revenue also places a direct burden on the tax resources of the local district. Perhaps even more important is maintenance of local control over the school system. It is axiomatic that control follows the purse strings.

Since sound management principles should require that every district, regardless of its size, make some contribution to the cost of the Foundation Program, it is suggested that the ultimate goal might be to reconstitute the organization of school districts in such a way that every district becomes a contributing partner to the cost of the Foundation Program. This should be accomplished without violating the equalization principle.

STATE FUND DISTRIBUTION

At the present time the State share of the Foundation School Program cost is paid from the State Available Fund and the Foundation School Fund.

The Constitution of Texas, Article 7, Section 5, provides "... And the Available School Fund herein provided shall be distributed to the several counties according to their scholastic population and applied in such manner as may be provided by law." The Legislature, through statutes, has defined a scholastic to be child between ages of six and seventeen inclusive residing in a school district.

It is provided also that a census of all children of scholastic age will be taken annually and that the Available School Fund will be distributed among the several counties of the State according to the scholastic population of each. Before making the distribution, a county administration per capita rate is determined in each county and a sufficient amount of money is deducted from the Available School Fund apportionment of each county to pay the cost of county administration. The result is that the State pays all but a very small portion of the cost of county administration.

The cost of the Foundation School Program is determined on the basis of average daily attendance in each school district. After the cost of the program is determined and the local funds assigned, the amount of the State per capita apportionment and the county per capita apportionment is subtracted from program cost to determine the eligibility of each district for Foundation School Program funds.

Distribution of the State Available School Fund on a resident-scholastic basis is in conflict with the equalization principle on which the Foundation School Program is based.

PROPOSAL II

1. The statutes should be amended to redefine a scholastic as a pupil within scholastic age in average daily attendance the preceding scholastic year in the public elementary and high school districts wholly within or under the jurisdiction of a county of this State.
2. Provision should be made for a biennial census on even numbered years under rules and regulations to be set by the State Board of Education.
3. Provision should be made for financing county school administration from local sources, and the abolition of county school administration in all counties where there is no longer need for such administration.

The implementation of these proposals would place all fund distribution for the support of the State share of the Foundation Program Act squarely on the basis of average daily attendance.

Simplification of administrative procedure both at the local and State level should also result from these changes.

At the time a scholastic was defined as a child in residence this was in line with the procedures then being followed in the distribution of State school aid. However, in view of the revised procedures for distribution of State school aid resulting from inauguration of the Minimum Foundation Program, it would be equally in keeping with the constitutional intent to now distribute State aid on the basis of average daily attendance.

It appears that this can be accomplished without a constitutional amendment. If, however, it is determined a constitutional amendment is necessary, the Committee recommends that the Legislature submit a constitutional amendment to effectuate this reform at the earliest possible time.

The functions performed by the office of the county school superintendent are an integral part of local school administration. As a matter of principle those functions that direct the day-to-day operation of the schools should be subject to the direct influence of those affected. Provision of funds from local sources to pay the cost of county school administration would be in harmony with current practices for other county services.

THE PERMANENT SCHOOL FUND

The Texas Permanent School Fund was established in Article 7, Section 2 and Section 5 or the Texas Constitution.

Section 2 - "All funds, lands, and other property heretofore set apart and appropriated for the support of public schools...one half (1/2) of the public domain of the State, and all sums of money that may come to the State from the sale of any portion of the same shall constitute a perpetual public school fund."

Section 5 - "The principal of all bonds and other funds, and the principal arising from the sale of the lands hereinbefore set apart to said school fund, shall be the Permanent School Fund; and all interest derivable therefrom and the taxes herein authorized and levied shall be the available school fund, to which the Legislature may add not exceeding one per cent annually of the total value of the Permanent School Fund..."

The Permanent School Fund is administered by the State Board of Education as an investment trust fund under investment rules set forth in the statutes.

All income derived from the sale of public school land, royalties, bonuses and mineral leases is deposited in the Permanent School Fund, which had a value of \$383,816,184 on July 1, 1958. During the year of 1956-57, the capital assets of the Permanent School Fund increased \$28,442,614. Rentals and bonuses from mineral leases accounted for \$12,936,907 of this increase, and \$15,505,707 was derived from land sales and royalty payments.

Generally, the statutory requirements provide that the Permanent School Fund may be invested in Texas municipal bonds or U.S. government securities. Income derived from the investments of the Permanent School Fund, which during 1956-57 amounted to \$9,355,826.31, is deposited to the Available School Fund and distributed to the public schools of the State each year in proportion to the number of scholastics in each district.

PROPOSAL III

1. The State Board of Education should be given authority to broaden the investment program of the Permanent School Fund to include corporate stocks and bonds. This authority would be granted under the same conditions and limitations expressed in the constitutional amendment which authorized the purchase of corporate stocks and bonds for the Permanent University Fund.
 2. The Permanent School Fund investment program should continue to furnish a market for school districts whose bonds have a limited demand.
-
-

An analysis of bond purchases by the State Board of Education indicates a current average return of about 2.91 per cent on all investments. A recent constitutional amendment has enabled the Permanent University Fund to receive a return of from 4.16 per cent to 5.25 per cent on investments in corporate bonds, preferred stocks, and common stocks while during the same period the State Permanent School Fund purchased municipal bonds at rates ranging from 3 1/2 per cent to 4 1/2 per cent.

The Permanent School Fund was established at a time when it was the only source of state support for public education in Texas. The interpretation of the constitutional provision which transferred mineral leases, bonuses, and rentals into the Permanent Fund was reflecting the intent of the framers of the State Constitution to guarantee the continued support for education in the only way which seemed feasible at the time.

Those responsible for establishing the Permanent School Fund actually expressed the hope that the income from it might provide forever, into perpetuity, all the support that would be needed to guarantee the continuance of the public schools.

The Permanent School Fund frequently provides the only market for certain school bond issues, particularly bond issues of small school districts. More than twenty per cent of the bonds purchased for the Permanent School Fund during the last three years have been from school districts which have received no other bid for their bonds.

FEDERAL AID

At the present time Texas public schools are receiving Federal funds in connection with certain phases of vocational education and the school lunch and milk programs. Also, some districts which are affected by Federal activities receive Federal allotments for maintenance and operation and building construction.

During 1956-57 the total cost of vocational education in Texas was \$13,456,000. Of this amount, \$1,828,000 came from Federal funds which were used primarily for: (1) Vocational teacher travel expenses; (2) portions of salary costs in budget balance districts; and (3) adult vocational education.

The school lunch and milk programs are financed primarily from income derived from the sale of meals. In some districts a small portion of the cost is paid from local tax sources. In 1956-57, the overall cost of the school lunch and milk programs was \$29,786,937.26, with \$4,727,528 of this amount (approximately 16 per cent) being received from Federal sources.

The Federal aid for maintenance and operation costs and for building costs in school districts affected by Federal activity amounted to \$12,494,604 in 1956-57. These funds are paid directly to the affected school districts by the Federal Government under rules and regulations prescribed by the Texas Education Agency. These funds are appropriated by the Congress to pay that portion of a school's cost brought about by Federal activity in the district.

PROPOSAL IV

Public education is the legal responsibility of the several sovereign states. This committee believes that control of public education by the states is essential to the proper functioning of education in a democracy.

This committee believes that financial assistance by the Federal Government to public education in vocational education, school lunch, and milk programs, and those contemplated under the National Defense Education Act, would be of material assistance in developing those programs and would not violate the principle of State control of public education.

Also, it is believed to be appropriate for the Federal Government to pay its fair share of the cost of education in communities in which Federal activities have placed an additional financial burden on public schools.

TRANSFERS

Present statutes provide that a pupil may be transferred from the school district in which he lives to another school district in the same county or to a contiguous district in an adjoining county by order of the county school superintendent upon written application of the child's parent or guardian. If the transfer of the pupil is protested by either the school district of the child's residence or the district receiving the transfer, the county board of school trustees either approves or rejects the transfer.

During the 1957-58 school year 49,481 pupils were transferred. Of the 232 counties reporting on the question, "Under What Conditions Are Pupils Denied Transfers?", 121 counties reported that transfers were denied for various reasons. Many school districts charge tuition on transferred pupils. The tuition charged is usually the difference between the actual per pupil cost of instruction and the amount of this cost which is borne by the State. In a number of instances, elementary districts which are required to operate under State and county valuations find it impossible to pay the tuition on transferred pupils and at the same time finance the operation of their own educational program. In such instances, the cost of tuition must be paid by the parent or guardian of the transferred child.

The effect of present statutes and practices on pupil transfers between school districts is the denial to some children of their opportunity to attend an accredited high school or, in some instances, to attend any high school without the payment of tuition. This is in violation of the guarantees written into law by the Minimum Foundation School Program which have sought to assure each child of the availability of 12 years of public school education.

PROPOSAL V

The Legislature should make provision for each school age child who is a resident of the State of Texas to attend school in any school district in the State when approved by the receiving district and have his attendance count toward the district's eligibility for state financial assistance.

REALLOCATION OF TAXING AUTHORITIES

In developing a program for financing governmental services specified tax sources must be available to each level of government. As a practical matter, the tax resource most accessible to local subdivisions of government is the ad valorem tax levy on real and personal property.

The State of Texas in 1950 relinquished provisions for a state-level ad valorem tax levy for general purposes, leaving this tax resource for use by local subdivisions of government. However, the State retained the ad valorem levy of not to exceed thirty-five (35¢) cents on \$100 valuation for school purposes. The income from this levy is paid into the State Available School Fund and such part of this as is necessary is dedicated by constitutional provision to the purchase of textbooks for the public schools. An additional State ad valorem tax is levied for

Confederate pensions and to finance the acquisition of buildings for the State-supported colleges.

PROPOSAL VI

1. The State should make additional tax resources available to counties and to local school districts by withdrawing completely from the field of ad valorem tax levy.
 2. Provision should be made for financing the cost of the public school textbook program from tax resources of the Available School Fund other than the ad valorem tax levy.
-

LOCAL SCHOOL BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

Texas school districts spend a substantial sum of money for materials and supplies. Each school district purchases these materials and supplies in accordance with rules and regulations established by the local board of school trustees. As a result of this practice, there is no uniformity throughout the State in purchasing procedures.

It has been established, through practice, that purchasing procedures calling for competitive bids result in the purchaser securing materials and supplies at fair prices. Suppliers usually quote better prices on quantity purchases than they can quote on small purchases. Many school districts in this State purchase their supplies in small quantities and do not have policies calling for competitive bids. It is quite likely that a higher unit price is being paid for materials and supplies than would be the case if purchases were made in larger quantities under a system of competitive bidding.

PROPOSAL VII

Provision should be made for each school district to be required to purchase materials, supplies, and contracted services under a system of competitive bidding. Consideration should be given to some means of quantity purchasing for groups of school districts.

Estimated Cost of Hal

Number of
 Profession- 1958-59 Cost Under Presen
 al Units Program 9-months

EXPENDITURES

Professional Units

Classroom Teacher Units	65,848	254,176,491
Special Service Units	2,625	10,164,000
Supervisors and/or Counselors	1,000	5,301,000
Gifted Children Units		
Vocational Education Units	2,925	13,569,075
Exceptional Teacher Units	1,240	4,912,880
Full-time Principal Units	1,690	10,189,010
Part-time Principal Units	(3,200)	1,862,400
Superintendents	1,072	7,613,344
Assistant Superintendents Units		
Pre-school Instructional Units (Non English Speaking Children)		

Total	76,400	307,788,200
-------	--------	-------------

Other Services and Proposals

Sick Leave		
Maintenance and Operation		25,147,800
Transportation		16,480,000
Increase for Current ADA		

Total Foundation Program Cost	349,416,000
-------------------------------	-------------

REVENUES

Less Local Fund Receipts

Local Funds Assigned	67,200,000	
Less \$100 per Professional Unit	7,640,000	
Less Special Land Exemption	1,289,742	
Less Tax Rate Deductions	75,172	
Less Loss to Budget Balance Schools	3,250,000	
Net Local Funds	54,945,086	
County Available and Budgetary Excess	875,000	
		55,820,086

Balance to be Paid from State Funds	293,595,914
-------------------------------------	-------------

Available School Fund

2,077,900 Scholastics @ \$75	155,842,500	
Less County Administration Cost	2,550,000	
Less Loss to Budget Balance Districts	2,050,000	
Less Net Contribution		151,242,500

Demand on Foundation Fund	142,353,414
---------------------------	-------------

Aikin Committee Proposals

1958-59 Cost Under Proposals 9½-months	Increase	Salary Increase	Addi- tional Units	Additional Units Cost	Other Changes
311,592,736	57,416,245	57,416,245			
14,663,000	4,499,000	2,252,250	475	2,246,750	
6,053,000	752,000	752,000			
1,030,320	1,030,320		265	1,030,320	
15,843,666	2,274,591	2,274,591			
5,944,560	1,031,680	1,031,680			
14,232,933	4,043,923	1,072,043	455	2,971,880	
1,862,400					
8,661,860	1,048,516	1,048,516			
979,279	979,279		133	979,279	
1,350,000	1,350,000			1,350,000	
382,213,754	74,425,554	65,847,325		8,578,229	
7,708,995	7,708,995				7,708,995
40,252,800	15,105,000				15,105,000
20,300,000	3,820,000			859,650	2,960,350
11,000,000	11,000,000				11,000,000
461,475,549	112,059,549	65,847,325		9,437,879	36,774,345
89,100,000					
75,172					
2,500,000					
86,524,828					
875,000					
87,399,828					
374,075,721	80,479,807				
128,972,290*					
1,500,000					
127,472,290					
246,603,431	104,250,017				

* State Ad Valorem Tax Deducted -
Comptroller's Report - 1957

H. C. R. 105 by HALE and AIKIN CREATING THE COMMITTEE of 24

WHEREAS, the Gilmer-Aikin Program, placed into operation in 1949, has provided material improvements in the educational opportunities of Texas boys and girls; but

WHEREAS, the scholastic population of the State of Texas is now increasing at an unprecedented rate; and

WHEREAS, the demands for an enlightened citizenship to meet and solve the problems created through the complex developments of this atomic and rapidly expanding technological age places a tremendous responsibility upon the public schools; and

WHEREAS, at a time when thousands of additional teachers are needed to teach additional pupils enrolling in the public schools, thousands of experienced teachers are leaving the profession; and

WHEREAS, despite the most valiant efforts by local citizens to provide the funds needed to construct schoolhouse facilities there still exists financially embarrassed districts which are unable to cope with the unusual building emergency thrust upon them; and

WHEREAS, the future of the boys and girls of this State and the welfare of this State and Nation depends upon the solution of these dire and pressing problems; and

WHEREAS, it is imperative to provide a long-range public education program that will meet the demands of the citizenship of this State;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, that a committee composed of twenty-four (24) members be immediately constituted to coordinate and complete a comprehensive study involving the citizenship of each and every county of this State; that said commission shall survey the needs of the public school system as related to curriculum, teacher supply, classroom facilities, and other related areas including adequate financing of the public school program; and that the Texas Education Agency shall work cooperatively with the commission to provide professional assistance, clerical help, and necessary printing.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint three (3) members of the House of Representatives and three (3) additional members of said committee, the Lt. Governor shall appoint three (3) members of the Senate and three (3) additional members of the Committee, the Governor shall appoint six (6) members of said committee and the State Board of Education shall appoint six (6) members of the committee, and that those members of the House of Representatives and Senate who serve on the committee shall receive living and travel expenses while away from home in attendance of

meetings of said committee, such travel and expenses to be paid from the Contingent Fund of the 55th Legislature; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that said committee is empowered to effect its own organization and adopt such procedure and operate as may be necessary to carry out fully the purposes herein described and shall make such recommendations to the Governor, the 56th Legislature, and the people of the State as it may determine the facts and conditions to warrant. Copies of each and every recommendation shall be filed with the Governor, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Lt. Governor, given to the press, and all statewide educational organizations within the state.

COUNTY COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

COUNTY	NAME	COUNTY	NAME
Anderson	Quannah Price	Comanche	James F. Fanning
Andrews	Jack Shepherd	Concho	Carl Peek
Angelina	T. J. Wilroy	Cooke	R. R. Kirby
Aransas	Charles A. Roe, Jr.	Coryell	Lovett Ledger
Archer	J. F. Gerron	Cottle	Rep. W. S. Heatley, Jr.
Armstrong	Mrs. Grace Wiegman	Crane	Wallace S. Johnston
Atascosa	L. J. Wistler	Crockett	L. B. T. Sikes
Austin	Dr. James B. Harle	Crosby	J. C. McNeill, III
Bailey	Glen Williams	Culberson	Herbert D. Smith
Bandera	Dan Alanis	Dallam	Newton Foster
Bastrop	Vallon L. Voight	Dallas	Ed Gossett
Baylor	Clyde Whiteside	Dawson	P. K. Humes
Bee	H. B. Langford, Jr.	Deaf Smith	Robert Wagoner
Bell	Dr. Truman Davis	Delta	Theron Dale Stockton
Bexar	Carlos Caon	Denton	H. O. Harris
Blanco	R. K. McKinney	DeWitt	W. F. Hancock
Borden	John R. Anderson	Dickens	Moyne L. Kelly
Bosque	Joe White	Dimmit	Herman Sullivan
Bowie	Rep. L. C. Terral	Donley	Homer Estlack
	Rep. George McCoppin	Duval	Dr. A. N. Saenz
Brazoria	Mrs. Ralph Gray	Eastland	Mrs. Joseph M. Perkins
Brazos	Ed J. Burkhart	Ector	T. B. Harris, Jr.
Brewster	Jim Glasscock	Edwards	Paul E. Barr
Briscoe	Mrs. Amelia Johnson	Ellis	Fred M. Shaw
Brooks	J. O. Jones	El Paso	Ted Address
Brown	Harley H. Black	Erath	E. C. Johnson
Burleson	Jennings Hill	Falls	Robert Burton
Burnet	Joe D. Evans	Fannin	J. W. Moulton
Caldwell	M. W. Glosserman	Fayette	Robert Schaefer
Calhoun	W. F. Tanner	Fisher	Nelson Smith
Callahan	Hugh Ross, Jr.	Floyd	H. H. Nicholas
Cameron	L. R. Baker	Foard	Mike D. Bird
Camp	Dr. R. K. Pendergrass	Fort Bend	W. L. Ansel
Carson	Clarence C. Williams	Franklin	Herman Connelly
Cass	Guy E. Goolsby	Freestone	H. C. Goolsby
Castro	M. E. Cleavinger, Jr.	Frio	Dr. Wendell E. Beall
Chambers	Joe Dick McClung	Gaines	Richard Jackson
Cherokee	Morris W. Hassell	Galveston	Joe Bowers
Childress	Wade Kimbrough	Garza	Dean A. Robinson
Clay	Harold C. Reynolds	Gillespie	Alfred Crenwelge
Cochran	Davis E. Benham	Glasscock	W. A. Wilson
Coke	D. K. Glenn	Goliad	Robert L. Moore
Coleman	Lee Williams	Gonzales	Leland H. Dickson
Collin	Clifford Carpenter	Gray	Aubrey L. Steele
Collingsworth	J. D. Wilson	Grayson	Byron Davis
Colorado	Lester Cranek	Gregg	Henry L. Foster
Comal	Mrs. Roland Zipp	Grimes	O. Dan Carter

COUNTY	NAME	COUNTY	NAME
Guadalupe	C. H. Donegan, Jr.	Lavaca	W. A. Eilers
Hale	R. V. Payne	Lee	R. J. Hejtmancik
Hall	Miss Mary Foreman	Leon	J. S. Winn
Hamilton	R. B. Jackson	Liberty	Lloyd E. Gilbert
Hansford	H. R. Hartman	Limestone	Mrs. T. W. Whaley
Hardeman	Nolan L. Jones	Lipscomb	Robert L. Green
Hardin	E. M. Prewitt	Live Oak	William J. Van Kleef
Harris	W. L. Wheeler	Llano	Milton E. Mayer
Harrison	Gaines Baldwin	Loving	L. H. Welch
Hartley	John Bookout	Lubbock	Dr. J. Davis Armistead
Haskell	Dale Graham	Lynn	Mrs. Ruth Jolly
Hays	Mrs. Gene Scrutchin	Madison	R. M. Henderson
Hemphill	Woodie E. Beene	Marion	W. J. Francis
Henderson	Mrs. Wayne Justice	Martin	Jess Miles
Hidalgo	Lloyd Lochridge	Mason	Carl Schmidt
Hill	Loyd Forrest	Matagorda	John H. Cherry
Hockley	Eddie Paxton	Maverick	E. L. Walter
Hood	Glenn C. Bowman	McCulloch	J. E. Herrington
Hopkins	Henry George Smith	McLennan	Glen W. Rollins
Houston	J. Marcus Mason	McMullen	Thomas A. Richey
Howard	Dr. W. A. Hunt	Medina	E. G. Burges
Hudspeth	James C. Cage	Menard	Mrs. M. S. Leggett
Hunt	Jesse L. Miller	Midland	J. Holt Jowell
Hutchinson	M. W. Graves	Milam	Hinton H. Pruett
Irion	M. H. Carr	Mills	John L. Patterson
Jack	Ernest B. Whitaker	Mitchell	Charles C. Thompson
Jackson	Gifford L. Hodges	Montague	Henry W. Johnson
Jasper	Johnnie McLeod	Montgomery	Tom W. Smith
Jeff Davis	Otis Grubb, Jr.	Moore	E. A. Wooten
Jefferson	Dr. Joe Stoeltje	Morris	Noble H. Moore
Jim Hogg	James G. Cole, Jr.	Motley	Vance H. Gilbreath
Jim Wells	C. A. Thormalen	Nacogdoches	Henry P. Schmidt
Johnson	Willard Baker	Navarro	Mrs. Mildred Griffin
Jones	Otto Sosebee	Newton	Aussie A. Miller
Karnes	Roy Freeman	Nolan	Caffey Welch
Kaufman	Edward Nash	Nueces	E. J. Wranosky
Kendall	John W. Belsey	Ochiltree	Mrs. Max Boyer
Kenedy	Mrs. Mabel Tate	Oldham	Truman R. Miller
Kent	R. E. Cooper	Orange	Julian P. Greer
Kerr	James Whelan, Jr.	Palo Pinto	B. H. Martin
Kimble	Grady Rogers	Panola	E. B. Morrison
King	Herman E. Walton	Parker	Bob Bergman
Kinney	Marion H. Wills	Parmer	Dillie M. Kelly
Kleberg	John S. Gillett	Pecos	Paul Counts
Knox	Merick McGaughey	Polk	Luther C. Moore
Lamar	Rosser E. Mason	Potter	H. O. Willborn
Lamb	Dr. Ralph Schilling	Presidio	Roy H. Godbold
Lampasas	Mrs. Penrose Hirst	Rains	Carl W. Waddle
LaSalle	Helen Storey	Randall	Dr. J. B. Roberts

COUNTY	NAME
Reagan	E. J. Compton
Real	W. B. Sansom
Red River	Kermit Wommack
Reeves	M. P. Withers
Refugio	W. F. Abney
Roberts	J. W. Thompson
Robertson	Leon Wilson
Rockwall	J. A. Wilkerson
Runnels	W. E. Elkins
Rusk	Homer L. Bryce
Sabine	John Lindsey
San Augustine	Rep. George Goetz
San Jacinto	Walter T. Carter
San Patricio	T. A. Harbin
San Saba	Jack B. Miller
Schleicher	A. M. Witis
Scurry	Orville Hess
Shackelford	A. V. Jones, Jr.
Shelby	Jimmy Jones
Sherman	R. W. Standefer, Jr.
Smith	A. Earl White
Somervell	Mrs. Inez Ernst
Starr	Arnulfo S. Martinez
Stephens	John Culwell
Sterling	Jack Douthit
Stonewall	Ralph Riddel
Sutton	Armer Earwood
Swisher	Claude T. Shelton
Tarrant	Clyde R. Ashworth
Taylor	Bobby Sayles
Terrell	Jack Hayre
Terry	H. L. King
Throckmorton	Mrs. N. L. B. Davis
Titus	Jerry Jones
Tom Green	Mrs. Ray Willoughby
Travis	Walter R. Koch
Trinity	L. F. Guseman
Tyler	T. E. Howell
Upshur	Jesse K. Denson
Upton	Norman Elrod
Uvalde	F. E. Beecroft
Val Verde	W. P. Wallace, Jr.
Van Zandt	Clyde Elliott, Jr.
Victoria	R. C. Pickett
Walker	Dr. Suler E. Ryan
Waller	Mrs. H. J. Boettcher
Ward	Charles Potts

COUNTY	NAME
Washington	B. P. Greenwade
Webb	Elmore H. Borchers
Wharton	A. T. Leveridge
Wheeler	T. M. Britt
Wichita	Floyd L. Randel
Wilbarger	Byron Phillips
Willacy	Rev. Franklin Hagberg
Williamson	Gilbert Conoley
Wilson	A. T. Hoelscher
Winkler	Nev H. Williams, Sr.
Wise	Fred R. Nickles
Wood	J. D. Wolseley
Yoakum	A. B. Carpenter
Young	R. E. Thornton
Zapata	Leopoldo Martinez, Jr.
Zavala	Lewis A. Parr